

REMARKS

The present Amendment is in response to the Office Action mailed March 10, 2004 in the above-identified application.

The Examiner objected to the specification because it had holes punched therethrough. In response, Applicants submit herewith a substitute copy of the specification and claims.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-2, 7-8, 13 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,286,043 to Cuomo et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,654,814 to Britton et al. Cuomo is directed to a system and process for properly presenting web pages having dynamic page content. Cuomo seeks to improve how web pages having dynamic page content are prepared, transferred and presented to a user at a web browser. Cuomo neither discloses nor suggests using a host web site for compiling the contents of information viewed by a user while the user "surfs the 'net," whereby the host web site modifies the content presented to the user based upon personal data about the user and the content of the web sites visited by the user.

Britton is directed to methods and systems for "tailoring" or synchronizing the format of information transferred from a server to a remote data processing system to insure that the information is presented in a proper format by the remote data processing system. Britton is not related to changing the substance of the information presented to a user, but changes how (i.e. format) the information is transferred to the user. Britton recognizes that hand-held devices have limited functionality in comparison to desktop computers for which most web content has been developed. As a result, images and text displayable on a desktop computer may not be displayable on a hand-held device. Britton also recognizes that the method of communication used to link web devices may change. During a first use, a landline may be used. During a subsequent communication, a wireless communication, such as a cellular telephone network, may be used. As a result, a format that may be acceptable when using the landline connection may be

unacceptable when using the wireless link. Thus, Britton is directed to obtaining session-specific information from a first data processing system and distributing "tailoring" or synchronizing functions between the first data processing system and the second data processing system. By basing the distribution of the tailoring functions on session-specific information, both the concerns of a particular user as well as the overall concerns of network management may be taken into account in "tailoring" the format of the information to be provided to the first data processing system.

For the above reasons, claim 1 is unobvious over Cuomo and Britton because the cited references neither disclose nor suggest a method of personalizing information presented at a host web site including "obtaining personal data about a user during a visit to the host web site." Neither Cuomo nor Britton disclose or suggest the concept of using a "host web site" to obtain personal data about a user during a visit to the host web site. Claim 1 is also unobvious because the cited references neither disclose nor suggest the step of "after obtaining the personal data, monitoring the content of other web sites visited by the user." Claim 1 is also unobvious because the cited references neither disclose nor suggest the step of "during a subsequent visit by the user to the host web site, personalizing the information presented to the user, wherein the content of the information presented to the user during the subsequent visit to the host web site is related to the content of the other web sites visited by the user." Although Cuomo discloses the concept of changing the content presented by a server in response to a user's interest, such activity occurs on only one server. Cuomo does not suggest that the surfing activities of a user may be tracked over multiple web sites, compiled and forwarded to a host web site, whereby the host web site presents information and content that is customized to reflect the user's personal data and surfing activities. For all of these reasons, claim 1 is unobvious over Cuomo and Britton and is otherwise allowable. Claims 2, 7-8 and 13 are also unobvious, *inter alia*, by virtue of their dependence from claim 1.

Claim 15 is also unobvious because Cuomo and Britton neither disclose nor suggest a method of personalizing information presented to a user of a host web site including "collecting identifying data about the user during a first visit to the host web site; [and] after collecting the identifying data, monitoring the content of other web sites visited by the user." As noted above, Cuomo is directed to solving problems associated with web pages having dynamic page content. Cuomo teaches monitoring a user's activities on only one web server, and does not suggest monitoring activities over multiple servers. This deficiency is not overcome by Britton. Claim 15 is also unobvious because the cited references neither disclose nor suggest "during a subsequent visit by the user to the host web site, personalizing the information presented to the user based upon the identifying data collected about the user and the content of the other web sites visited by the user."

The Examiner also rejected claims 4-6, 9-12 and 16-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cuomo and Britton as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of "Official Notice." In response, Applicants respectfully assert that Cuomo and Britton do not teach or suggest the limitations recited in independent claims 1 and 15. These deficiencies are not overcome by the "Official Notice." As a result, claims 4-6 and 9-12 are unobvious, *inter alia*, by virtue of their dependence from claim 1 and claims 16-18 are unobvious, *inter alia*, by virtue of their dependence from claim 15.

The Examiner rejected claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cuomo and Britton as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,701,362 to Subramonian et al. The Examiner has cited Subramonian as teaching that the "monitoring and collecting step is performed only if it [is] authorized by the user." In response, Applicants respectfully assert that Subramonian does not overcome the deficiencies noted above in Cuomo and Britton. Thus, claim 3 is unobvious and is otherwise allowable.

The Examiner rejected claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cuomo and Britton as applied to claim 13 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,606,581 to Nickerson et al. The Examiner has cited Nickerson as teaching that personal data includes a "user's name, address, zip code, occupation, telephone number, educational level, income, marital status, home ownership status, age and other personal information." In response, Applicants respectfully assert that Nickerson does not overcome the deficiencies noted above in Cuomo and Britton. Thus, claim 14 is unobvious and is otherwise allowable.

As it is believed that all of the rejections set forth in the Official Action have been fully met, favorable reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited.

If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that he telephone Applicants' attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional objections which he might have.

If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: June 9, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Michael J. Doherty
Registration No.: 40,592
LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,
KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP
600 South Avenue West
Westfield, New Jersey 07090
(908) 654-5000
Attorney for Applicant